40. (New) A compound substrate having a structured surface comprising a substantially replicated portion and a machined portion, the compound substrate further comprising at least one compound face thereon wherein the at least one compound face has a substantially planar surface having a first face portion on the machined portion of the compound substrate and a second face portion on the substantially replicated portion of the substrate, the first and second face portions being on opposite side of the transition line.

Remarks

Claims 38 to 40 have been added. Support for new claims 38-40 can be found in the specification, for example, in Figs. 9-14.

35 USC § 112 Rejections

Claims 1-8 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner argues that the "claim does not disclose the position of the plurality of faces, e.g., on an external exposed surface of the structure or at the internal interfaces of the two substrates. "(Office Action, Paragraph 3)" Applicants disagree with this rejection.

Claim 1 clearly states that at least one of the plurality of the faces are "located on" the compound substrate. (Claim 1, lines 1-3, emphasis added). Since at least one of the faces are on the compound substrate, it cannot be located at an interface between the two substrates.

In light of these comments, it is believed that Applicants have overcome the rejection of claims 1-8 and 15. Favorable action is solicited.

35 USC § 102 Rejections

1. Claims 1-4, 6-8 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Mihalik (U.S. Patent 3,741,623). Applicants traverse the rejection.

Mihalik relates to a combined lens and reflector. This reference discloses two independent substrates in interfacial contact with one another. However, Mihalik fails to disclose the use of a single substrate having two portions, i.e., the compound substrate as claimed by Applicants. Additionally, Mihalik fails to disclose that the single substrate has a plurality of faces on it. To the contrary, the interfacial contact disclosed by Mihalik cannot provide a plurality of faces on a single substrate. Accordingly, Mihalik cannot anticipate claims 1-4 and 6-8.

Mihalik fails to anticipate others of claims 1-4 and 6-8 for additional reasons. For example, Mihalik does not disclose the compound faces of claims 3 and 4; the location of portions of the compound faces on both the machined and replicated portions of the compound substrate as further required by claims 3 and 4; the substantial alignment of the portions of the compound faces with each other as required by claim 4; the transition line required by claims 6-7; termination of the compound face at a nondihedral edge as required by claim 7; or the face having a plan view consisting of a hexagon or a rectangle as required by claim 8.

With regard to the transition line of claims 6-7, the Examiner has argued that the interfacial contact of Mihalik constitutes the transition line of Applicants' claim. This is not correct. The transition line of claims 6-7 is a line or other elongated feature that separates the two portions of the compound face. These two portions are substantially aligned with one another, although they can be slightly off set. See the specification at page 26, lines 13-18, page 28, lines 25-26 and Figs. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14.

2. Claims 1-4, 6-8, and 16-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Amemiya (U.S. Patent 5,429,857). Applicants traverse this rejection.

Amemiya fails to anticipate the present invention for the same reasons that Mihalik fails to anticipate claims 1-4 and 6-8. Thus, it fails to describe the compound substrate of Applicants claims; the presence of faces on a single compound substrate; the use of compound faces; substantial alignment of the compound faces; a transition line; faces having termination of the compound face at a nondihedral edge; or a defined plan view. Like Mihalik, Amemiya teaches only interfacial contact of the separate substrates. As discussed above, this is not the transition line taught by Applicants.

With respect to claims 16-19, Amemiya also fails to teach the discontinuous machined substrate covering only a portion of the structured surface. With regard to claims 20-23 Amemiya also fails to teach the machined substrate disposed in discrete pieces on the structured surface.

3. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 16, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Oshima (U.S. Patent 5,866,233). Applicants traverse this rejection.

Like Mihalik and Amemiya, this reference discloses only interfacial contact between two substrates. Consequently, it does not disclose the compound substrate applicants have claimed; the presence of two faces on the compound substrate; the use of compound faces on the substrate; a transition line; termination of the compound face at a nondihedral edge; a discontinuous machined substrate covering only a portion of the structured surface; or at least one face and one other face being on opposite sides of a transition line, wherein all transition lines are substantially parallel to a reference plane.

4. Claims 1-4, 6-8, and 16-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Bacon (U.S. Patent 5,614,286). Applicants traverse this rejection.

Bacon fails to describe a compound substrate having a machined portion and a replicated portion. On this basis alone, it fails to anticipate claims 1-4, 6-8, and 16-23.

5. Claims 1-4, 6-8, and 16-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Nilsen (U.S. Patent 5,657,162). Applicants traverse this rejection.

Nilsen fails to anticipate the claims for all of the reasons discussed above with regard to Mihalik.

35 USC § 103 Rejections

Claim 15 stands rejected as obvious over any of Mihalik, Oshima, Bacon or Nilsen. Applicants traverse this rejection.

As discussed above, none of the references teach the present invention. Thus, none of the references can teach a retroreflective article made by the mold of claim 11. In fact, none of them even recognize the benefit of using faces on a compound substrate wherein at least a portion of the faces is present on each part of the compound substrate. As Applicants have shown that none of the

references teach the claimed article, the references do not suggest how to make the claimed article. As a result, the references do not render claim 15 obvious.

New Claims 38-40

New claims 38-40 have been presented. These claims clearly state that, inter alia, the faces on the substrate are compound faces. As taught in the specification at page 26, lines 13-18, compound faces have two distinguishable faces that are proximate each other and in substantial alighment with each other. Stated another way, they are not in face-to-face relationship. Rather, they are in substantially the same plane. This concept is neither taught nor suggested by the references.

Conclusion

Based on the previous remarks, Applicants believe they have shown the claims to be allowable. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all claims is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

October 8, 2002
Date

By: James V. Lilly
James V. Lilly, Reg. No.: 27,817
Telephone No.: 651-733-1543

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
P.O. Box 33427
St. Paul, MN 55133-3427
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833